

Tech Transfer Task Group Inaugural Meeting

October 15, 2001

The Task Group had its initial meeting at the Huntsman Cancer Institute from 9-11 a.m.

Attending were Germaine Ward, Ray Gesteland, Brent Miller, Gary Hooper, Rick Mandahl, Randy Block, Vaughn North, Cindy Hilyard, Nile Hatch, Paul Ahlstrom, Mark Renda, Rod Linton, and Steve Prescott. Absent: Jim Jensen.

The meeting was opened by a discussion of the goals, which led into a discussion of many topics – the group agreed that an important component was to define the mission. Paul Ahlstrom will write a first draft of a mission statement. All agreed that facilitating economic development with a subcategory of creating good jobs is the overall goal of the Governor's initiative and that our specific task is to insure that valuable technology generated in the universities (and potentially other organizations) can be transferred as efficiently as possible to a commercial venue. We began by discussing whether there currently are barriers to such transfer and, if so, where they are. All of the group participated with descriptions of perceived barriers including a need to educate university faculty on the scope of what could be valuable, a corresponding educational effort in business – particularly small/start-up businesses – on restrictions (e.g., Bayh-Dole). Also identified were some practices of the technology transfer offices at the various universities recognizing that they have different goals and procedures. Further, it was pointed out that by many measures their performance is very good. Nonetheless, there was a general perception that there is room for improvement. Much of the discussion in this area centered

around aligning the goals of the offices in charge of such decisions with broader goals for economic development, university development and faculty desires.

One recurring topic was how to develop policies that would have the maximal effect on simulating the growth of such industry in Utah (i.e., how to put Utah companies first). It was noted that there are existing tax incentives but it was thought that these could be tied more closely to Utah investment. Val Finlayson volunteered to get summaries of those bills for the other members of the committee to review.

At the level of faculty inventors several barriers were identified. These included the desire to maximize achievements that lead to academic reward, since this allows them to stay mobile with respect to job opportunities. As one solution Utah State University has developed policies that consider patents and other entrepreneurial activities as supporting achievements for traditional academic milestones, such as promotion and tenure. Brigham Young University and the University of Utah now are reviewing policies including such actions as well as conflict of interest and, in the case of BYU, "Conflict of Effort" guidelines to insure that the encouragement of faculty to participate in such efforts does not lead to conflict with their teaching and other academic duties. One of the comments during this stage of discussion was that research efforts tend to be national or global in nature whereas commercialization efforts are predominantly local. Thus, there will be an inherent tension in encouraging scientists and engineers on university faculties to emphasize contributions that will lead to local commercialization since

their instinct will be to focus on the national or international collaborations. Several members of the committee returned to the idea that the environment around Stanford University, the University of California at San Francisco, and the entrepreneurial culture in the San Francisco Bay area had led to circumstances where faculty members saw a specific advantage for them to be directly engaged in such discussions and activities. This had a synergistic effect and with an acceleration of efforts on all fronts. It was widely agreed that we should try to understand how this occurred and develop such a phenomenon here.

The discussion around an educational effort regarding what constitutes valuable intellectual property and how it should be protected led to a suggestion that the committee recommend the development of a curriculum designed both for university faculty and perhaps a second curriculum for small businesses. Such an effort would have to be developed in collaboration with the Technology Transfer offices at each of the major research universities and would try to raise awareness of the possibilities for commercialization and processes need to protect such information. The Centers of Excellence program was proposed for a potential location for such a program.

With respect to functions of the Technology Transfer offices, we reviewed how they currently are funded at the different universities and in all cases there was the perception that the departments lacked adequate resources to conduct their business in the most desirable manner. Two of the areas that were thought to be particularly deficient were efforts to market the discoveries and a vigorous business development focus. Ideas on how to get more resources into this part of the process included possible public/private partnerships (including utilization of

existing federal and perhaps state programs). Another area of discussion centered on the business model used by technology transfer offices and there was broad support for flexibility including models with minimal licensing fees but with an equity position. This is the practice in some cases but one barrier is that the state of Utah does not allow universities to hold direct equity stakes (this does not apply to BYU because it is a private institution). During this discussion one suggestion seconded by several members was that we should try to define the essential features of a technology transfer process and then ask how well that "minimized" model corresponds to current policies and procedures at the technology transfer offices.

MEDICAL DEVICES

Abbott Critical Care Systems
Aciont Incorporated
Acumed
Advanced Optical Systems
Alpha Protech, Inc.
Americal Medical Laser Incorporated
Apollo Light Systems, Inc.
Applied Water Engineering, Inc.
Arlington Scientific, Inc.
Axon Medical, Inc.
Baal Medical Products, Inc.
Bard Access Systems
Bausch & Lomb Surgical
BD Medical Systems
Boimicro Systems
Bionic Technologies, Inc.
Boston Scientific
BSD Medical Corporation
Bunnell, Inc.
Calorimetry Sciences Corp.
Catheter Innovations, Inc.
Ceramatec, Inc.
Clinical Innovations Associates, Inc.
Crantech Research
Cryolife, Inc.
Cyclopss Corporation
Cytozyme Laboratories, Inc.
Dexterity Design
Diacor, Inc.
Dynatronics Corporation
Easyseat
Edwards Life Sciences
Excalibur Engineering
Eye Prosthetics of Utah
Fresenius U.S.A., Inc.
GE/OEC Medical Systems, Inc.
Handtronix, Inc.
Harding & Harris
Hart Scientific, Inc.
Heart Scan, Inc.
Hemametrics
Hemogenesis
Heredilab, Inc.
HGM Medical Laser Systems, Inc.
IBA of Utah
Iconix Research
IMSI
Infection Control Technologies
Industrial Instruments
In-Touch Products, Inc.

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Advanced Clinical Research
Affiliated Genetics, Inc.
Altea
Anesta Corporation
Aral Biosynthetics, Inc.
Arup Research Institute
Cognetix, Inc.
Deltagen Proteomics
Echelon Research Laboratories, Inc.
Emergen, Inc.
Frontier Biomedical, Inc.
Frontier Scientific, Inc.
Howard Hughes Medical Institute
Huntsman Cancer Institute
Hyclone Laboratories, Inc.
Idaho Technology
Iomed, Inc.
Jean Brown Associates, Inc.
KK Biomed Corporation
Lipocine, Inc.
Lumitekk
Macromed, Inc.
Myriad Genetics, Inc.
National Clinical Resources, Inc.
Nelson Laboratories, Inc.
NPS Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Pharmacology Research Corp.
Pharmadigm, Inc.
Pherin Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Plant Bioactives Research
Post Nova
Radiant Research
Salus Therapeutics
Sorensen-Genomics
Watson Laboratories, Inc.
Western Institute for Biomedical Research
Zars, Inc.

MEDICAL DEVICES

Inmedica Development Corp.
ISC Bioexpress
Kimberly/Ballard Medical Products
KWM Electronics
Laser Corporation
Maxtec, Inc.
Medical Physics, Inc.
Medical Skyhook Company
Medical Techniques, Inc.
Medquest Products, Inc.
Medtronic Functional Diagnostics
Merit Medical Systems, Inc.
Microlin
Neuroinsight, LLC
Nortrade Medical, Inc.
Nytone Incorporated
Ortho Development Corporation
Otto-Bock Orthopedic, Inc.
Paradigm Medical Industries, Inc.
Process Instruments, Inc.
Precision Vascular Systems, Inc.
Prototech P & D
Rocky Mountain Research, Inc.
Ross Southern Labs
Rubicon Medical, Inc.
Sacros Research Corporation
Scytek Laboratories
Sonic Innovations, Inc.
Sorenson Bioscience, Inc.
Sorenson Medical
Specialized Health Products
Specialized Prosthetics & Orthotics
Spiricon Incorporated
Tamaryn Medical Systems
Techniscan, Inc.
Terra Tek, Inc.
Thoughtform Corporation
Utah Medical Products, Inc.
Varian Medical Systems
Wescor, Inc.
Wolfe Tory Medical, Inc.
Zevex International, Inc.

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Technology Transfer Task Group Progress Report December 18, 2001

The Technology Transfer Task Group began in the spring with background work by the Chairman and by staff from the Governor's office. The first effort was to survey the landscape nationally as well as within the state of Utah. This was accomplished by a report done by an MBA class from Brigham Young University under the direction of Dr. Prescott and Mr. Rod Linton. In addition, a variety of publications regarding these issues were identified. Subsequently, the Task Group was assembled by obtaining nominations, reviewing the credentials of the nominees, and inviting them to participate (see attached list for members). With this background, the Group had its first meeting on October 15 and had a subsequent meeting on November 19. The next meeting is scheduled for January 2002.

In the first meeting, the Group reviewed the background material and had far-ranging discussions regarding the perceptions of barriers to the transfer of technology – both leaving our research universities and coming into them from corporations that have needs for sponsored research. The first goals for the Group were to define its mission, which all agreed was to support economic development in Utah, and to lay out a plan of information gathering over the next few months. We agreed that we would invite formal presentations by the technology transfer offices at the University of Utah, Utah State University (and a separate presentation by its Foundation), and Brigham Young University. In addition, we will study programs around the nation in order to define best practices at both public and private universities. We also agreed to hear of innovative

programs undertaken in Virginia and Maryland. Likewise, various members of the Task Group are engaged in local initiatives with relevance to our mission, and each of them will be scheduled to make formal presentations.

This plan was implemented at its first step in the meeting on November 19 where the task group heard detailed presentations from the University of Utah and Utah State University Technology Transfer Offices.

Thus far, there are no explicit proposals for either policy changes or legislation.

Technology Transfer Task Force Group

Paul Ahlstrom
Managing Director
VSpring Capital

Randy Block
President/Consultant
The Gamut Technology Group

Val Finlayson
Executive Director
The Utah Partnership
For Education and Economic
Development, Inc.

Ray Gesteland, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research
University of Utah

Nile Hatch
Assistant Professor
Brigham Young University

Cindy Hilyard
Insight Shift – Strategic Marketing
Services

Gary Hooper, Ph.D.
Associate Academic Vice President
Brigham Young University

Jim Jensen
Vice President
Corporate Development
NPS Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

Rod Linton
Executive Director
Utah Technology Alliance

Rick Mandahl
Client Business Manager
AT&T

Brent Miller, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research
Utah State University

Vaughn North
Registered Patent Attorney
Thorpe North & Western, LLP

Steve Prescott, M.D.
Executive Director
Huntsman Cancer Institute

Mark Renda
Associate Director
Utah Technology Alliance

Germaine Ward
Vice President
Iomega Corporation